

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated March 20, 2008. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

At paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the currently pending claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of U.S. Publication 2004/0008828 ("Coles") and U.S. Patent number 5,757,904 ("Anderson"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Coles discloses an information retrieval system for monitoring a conversation between two or more parties that automatically detects keywords used during the conversation. An information database is automatically searched for information relevant to the conversation based on the collected keywords. A keyword list and an information list are displayed on a workstation display in the Coles system to allow an agent user to manually select/deselect one or more of the detected keywords and/or retrieved information, in order to adjust the priority of the keywords and/or information. As keywords and/or information are selected/deselected by the agent user, the displayed keyword list and information list are dynamically updated based on new priorities and/or how much time has passed since a keyword was mentioned in the conversation.

The workstations of Coles include a memory with a data base containing the dictionary of keywords used to match words recognized by the voice recognition circuit. The keywords within the Coles keyword dictionary are initially assigned weighted values. As words are recognized by the Coles voice recognition circuit, the words are dynamically matched to keywords within the keyword dictionary. The keywords recognized in Coles are initially compiled into the list displayed to the agent using the weights assigned to the keywords in the keyword dictionary. As

the conversation proceeds, Coles teaches that when a keyword is matched more than once, the weight assigned to the keyword may be adjusted upward. Similarly, as the frequency at which a keyword is repeated increases, the weight assigned to the keyword is adjusted upward. Conversely, as the duration of time between usage of keywords increases, the weight assigned to the keyword is decreased. Thus, the displayed keyword list for a conversation in Coles is dynamically compiled and adjusted, and a revised keyword list display is dynamically created during the conversation without requiring direct input from the agent.

Anderson discloses a system for presenting information to a call center agent in a context-sensitive manner that monitors activities, such as keyboard or pointer input from an agent and information being displayed to the agent at an agent position of a call center. The Anderson system receives a request for information, such as directory information or a list of wrapup codes from the agent, and in response analyzes the request within the context of the monitored activities to determine a subset of the requested information, such as selected telephone numbers or a selected wrapup code, which is most relevant to the monitored activities. The Anderson system then either presents only the subset to the agent in response to the request, or presents the requested information in a manner that emphasizes the subset over the rest of the requested information. Specifically, upon completion of a call by transfer, hangup, or some other manner, agents are required to enter a wrap up code that classifies the call into one of multiple categories. In response selection of the wrap up code, the Anderson workstation evaluates the events that it has detected for the call, and determines which wrapup category best fits the call. For example, the Anderson workstation would select a "call transferred" wrapup code or a "change of reservations" wrapup code, and then displays all of the wrapup codes to its agent and highlight

the wrap-up code that it selected as the suggested wrap-up code for the call. The agent in Anderson can either accept the suggestion or reject it by entering another code.

Nowhere in the combination of Coles and Anderson is there described or suggested a system or method for processing a received call, including:

routing the received call to an agent;
detecting a change of mode event;
responsive to said detecting said change of mode event, entering a muted command mode during which a caller of said call is prevented from hearing said agent speaking;
receiving, during said muted command mode, at least one call description voice command from said agent; and
storing at least one activity code associated with said at least one call description voice command in a data record associated with said received call, wherein said at least one activity code describes said received call. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. Independent claims 13 and 25 include analogous features. Neither Coles nor Anderson describe or suggest storing activity codes in a data record that describes a call. In contrast, Coles displays keywords detected during a call that may be used to retrieve and prioritize information displayed to an agent during the call. The keywords in Coles during a conversation are stored in a display list based on their associated weights (see paragraph 26), and are used to retrieve other information to be displayed to the agent during the call (see paragraph 37). Anderson describes classifying calls based on wrap-up codes, and teaches maintaining records that are associated with not with calls, as in the present independent claims, but instead with *customers* (see column 7, lines 10-26, i.e. “Mr. Allen’s record”). Accordingly, neither the display list of detected keywords of Coles nor the classification of calls using wrap-up codes of Anderson discloses or suggests *storing at least one activity code associated with said at least one call description voice command in a data record associated with said received call,*

wherein said at least one activity code describes said received call, as in the present independent claims.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Coles and Anderson does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 13 and 25. The combination of Coles and Anderson accordingly does not form a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the present independent claims 1, 13 and 25. As to claims 2-7, 12, 14-19, and 24, they each depend from claims 1 and 13, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Coles and Anderson for at least the same reasons.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections based on Coles and Anderson be withdrawn.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicant's Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 20, 2008
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131